THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR THE

Siddhānta Dipikā and Āgamic Review.

A Monthly Journal devoted to the Search for Truth as revealed in the Ancient Hindu Mystic Philosophy known as the Śaiva Siddhānta or Āgamānta.

VOL. XII. MADRAS, MARCH, 1912. No. 9.

PURA-NĀNŪRU.

(Continued from page 292 of No. 7 Vol. XII.)

சோழன் நெய்தலங்கானல் இளஞ்சேட்சென்னியை
ஊன்பொதி பசுங்குடையார் பாடியது.

வழிபடு வோரை வல்லறி தீயே
பிறர்பழி கூறுவோர் மொழிதே றலையே
நீமெய் கண்ட தீமை காணி
னொப்ப நாடி யத்தக வொறுத்தி
வந்தடி பொருந்தி முந்தை நிற்பிற்
றண்டமுந் தணிதிநீ பண்டையிற் பெரிதே
யமிழ்தட் டானாக் கமழ்குய் யடிசில்
வருநர்க்கு வரையா வசையில் வாழ்க்கை
மகளிர் மலைத்த லல்லது மள்ளர்
மலைத்தல் போகிய சிலைத்தார் மார்ப
செய்திரங் காவினைச் சேண்விளங் கும்புகழ்
நெய்தலங் கான நெடியோ
யெய்தவந் தனம்யா மேத்துகம் பலவே. (10)

To Neidalaṅkūnal Iḷañjêṭçenni, the Chōḷan,
by Ūnpodi Pasuṅkuḍaiyār.

Thou art quick of discernment when men pay their court to thee; thou art slow to credit the men that proclaim the guilt of others; if thou seest evil that wears the guise of good thou searchest well into it and dost punish as befits; when the offender approaches thy feet and stands before thee thou dost mitigate thy punishment; to those that come to thee thou dost unstintingly give feasts of rice with condiments whose rich perfume exceeds that of ambrosia; thy life is irreproachable; thou contendest not with warrior tribes but with the women of thy home. Such art thou upon whose breast is a garland coloured like the rainbow of Indra! Thou art one whose deeds once done need never to be repented of! Thy glory shines resplendant far and wide! O mighty king of Neythalamkānal we have come to greet thy presence and to sing manifold hymns of praise. (10)

சேரமான் பாலைபாடிய பெருங்கடுங்கோவைப் பேய்மகள்
இளவெயினி பாடியது.

அரிமயிர்த் திரண்முன்கை
வாலிழை மடமங்கையர்
வரிமணற்புனை பாவைக்குக்
குலவுச்சினைப் பூக்கொய்து
தண்பொருநைப் புனற்பாயும்
விண்பொருபுகழ் விறல்வஞ்சிப்
பாடல்சான்ற விறல்வேந்தனும்மே
வெப்புடைய வரண்கடந்து
துப்புறுவர் புறம்பெற்றிசினே
புறம்பெற்ற வயவேந்தன்
மறம்பாடிய பாடினியும்மே
பேருடைய விழுக்கழஞ்சிற்
சீருடைய விழைபெற்றிசினே
யிழைபெற்ற பாடினிக்குக்
குரல்புணர்சீர்க் கொளைவல்பாண்மகனும்மே, எனவாங்
கொள்ளழற் புரந்த தாமரை
வெள்ளி நாராற் பூப்பெற் றிசினே. (11)

To Peruṅkaḍuṅkō, the author of Cêramānpālai, by Pêimagaḷ Iḷaveyini.

THE COMPLAINT OF THE "FURY".*

The conquering ruler renowned in song of victorious *Vañji*, whose praise reaches to heaven, where in the cool waters of the river *Porunai*, the innocent maidens with curly hair and rounded arms plunging bathe, after plucking clustering flowers, wherewith to adorn the puppet they have fashioned out of the sand on the banks,—has occupied the dreaded fortress and seen his enemies flee before him!

The songstress adorned with bright jewels, that sang the valour of the mighty king, who thus saw his enemies disperse, has received as a reward bracelets of fine gold, weighty and precious.

And the minstrel, skilled in choral song, who tuned the music that sounded out, in harmony with the praises of the songstresses that gained the bracelets, has also obtained a gift of wreaths of Lotus flowers of beaten gold, strung together with threads of silver. (11)

G. U. P.

---

* This curious fragment, about which much doubt seems to have existed among the commentators, has certain peculiarities which seem to mark it out as of ancient date.

It is, in fact, a Sphinx's riddle, of which we can only offer what seem to be a probable solution.

It is said to have been sung by a damsel, whose name was *Iḷaveyini* (The Maiden of the early Dawn) in the character of a Demoness or Fury, in honour of Peruṅkaḍuṅkō.

It is supposed that the songstress means to imply very strongly that there is no reward for her, and that nothing remains for her to do or expect in the happy land, where the victories of the king have introduced a period of profound peace.

If we compare 62 with P.P. V-Mālai we shall see what occupation and reward she could expect in time of war; but her occupation is gone. The land requires now, and rewards, other minstrels.

It will be seen that by implication the highest praise is here offered to the King, who has banished wars and Furies for ever from his realm.

VĀSUDEVA UPANISHAT*. No. 56.

Om. The holy Nārada addressed the universal Lord, Vāsudeva, with adoration. Instruct me, O Lord, the rules of Ūrdhva Puṇḍra (a vertical sign of Gopichandana paste on the forehead and other places of the body); and also inform me the material by which it is made of, the mantras which are to be recited when applying it, and the places where it should be applied.

2. The Lord Vāsudeva replied: The origin of the Gopīchandana was from the Vaikunṭha regions. It delights me and was made a paste by my devotees, Brahmā and others on their body. It is called 'Vishṇu-chandana' (Sandal paste of Vishṇu). It was applied on my body daily by Gopīs and removed. Hence 'Gopichandana.'

3. It is the means of attaining Salvation as it was besmeared in my body; it is holy and is in the consecrated water of my disc. It has the emblem of my disc on it, with white colour.

4. Next, one should handle it with adoration, chanting the mantra; "O Gopichandana, the destroyer of sins, O Thou, that hast come forth from the body of Vishṇu, and hast emblem of the disc, I adore thee. Give me Salvation. I apply thee on my body." He should fetch water reciting the mantra 'O Gaṅgā, hear this &c;' rub it uttering 'Vishnornukam' &c., and apply it on his body reciting the mantras "Let, therefore, the Devas protect me," and by Vishṇu Gāyatri (Nārāyanāya Vidmahe &c); or uttering the names 'Keśava' &c., (the twelve names of Vishṇu from Keśava to Dāmodara).

5. The Brahmachāri and Vānaprastha should apply the

---

* This is the only Upanishat important to the Brahmins who use the Gopīchandana as their caste mark. This also advocates the Brhmā Dhārana at the end.

paste on the forehead, breast, neck and fore arms, uttering either the Vaishṇava Gāyatri, or Krishṇa and other names.

6. The Grihastha (house-holder) should consecrate it repeating thrice the verse with meditation: "O bearer of the conch-shell, disc and club in hands, O the Dweller in the Dvārakā, Achuta, Govinda, O lotus-like eyed one, protect me, who has taken refuge in thee;" and apply it in the twelve places, crown of the head &c., by the second finger (ring-finger) chanting the Vaishṇava Gāyatri or Keśava and other names.

7. Brahmachāri and the householder should apply it on the forehead, breast, neck and forearms uttering either the Vaishṇava Gāyatri, or Krishṇa and other names.

8. The Sanyāsin should apply it by the fore-finger on the crown, forehead, and breast, uttering the Praṇava alone.

9. The three vertical lines* represent the three embodied ones Brahmā &c, the three Vyâhritis (Bhū &c,) the three Vedic metres, the three sacred fires, the three luminaries (the Sun &c), the three times, the three states of consciousness, the three Ātmans, and the letters A, U, and M. Thus the Ūrdhva Puṇdra is of Praṇava. This is Ātman. It is Sat (being) and Om.

10. All these manifestations are one.

11. As it (symbolizes the) uplifting to the higher regions the aspirants of Om, one, therefore, should apply the Ūrdhva Puṇdra.

12. The Paramahamsa can apply a single line of Ūrdhva Puṇdra on his forehead, reciting Praṇava.

13. The yogi attains the state of my equaliy (Sāyujya), realising his Self in it which reveals the Truth like a lamp.

14. Or, one may realise it (the Truth) in the centre of the paste on the breast, or in the lotus-like heart, as it is said: "In the centre of it (heart) there is a fine flame of light which burns upwards, which is as bright as the flash of lightening in the middle of the blue cloud. This Supreme Self is as fine

*Some who apply the Gopīchandana on the forehead vertically without the three lines, it seems, have no Vedic sanction.

as the ear of the wild rice-grains (nivāra)." Therefore one should relealise the Self which is in the lotus-like heart as remaining in the Puṇdra.

15. Thus one should gradually realise me the Supreme Hari, who is the one's own Self. He, who meditates on me, the imperishable Hari, with undivided attention, and also on his own Self as residing in his lotus-like heart, attains Salvation. There is no doubt in this. He also realises by devotion my nature which is secondless, all pervading, without beginning, middle and end, self-shining, and which is existence, consciousness and bliss.

16. The only one Vishṇu dwells uninterruptedly in all moveable and immoveable things. I, as the Self, dwell in all beings. Like the oil in the oil-seed, the fire in the firewood, the cream in the milk, and like the odour in the flowers, I am dwelling in all beings.

17. One reaches the goal by pasting the Gopichandana on his crown, between the eye-brows, and on the breast, and there meditating on Hari, the Sun of consciousness.

18. The Sanyāsin, who uplifts his senses, who draws his vital current upwards, has Ūrdhva Puṇdra caste mark on his body and who practices the centripetal meditation, reaches the upper regions as he possesses the four upper-tending practices. Thus one obtains for himself the decisive knowledge by my devotion. One should, therefore, possess exclusive devotion having the paste Gopichandana on his body.

19. It is well ordained that all the Vaidika Brahmins should have the Ūrdhva Puṇdra prepared by Gopichandana and water.

20. If one, desirous of Salvation, does not procure the Gopichandana, should have the substitute from the earth of the root of the Tulasi plant, in order to obtain the direct perception of the Self.*

---

* This indicates the Gopichandana rule does not bolong to the *niyamā vidhi*, (necessary injunction), like that of Bhasma but it belongs to the optional one.

21. One should besmear himself with the holy ashes, procured from the sacred fire of the Atirātra Sacrifices, reciting the mantras "Agner bhasitam," (the holy ashes are from the fire), "I ḍanu* Vishṇu," "Trini Pada" (the three steps).

Vishṇu Gāyatri, and Praṇava.

22. By this method one should have the Gopichandana on his body (when the Śruti authoritatively pronounces thus many do not use Bhasma above Gopichandana paste and violate the injunction).

23. He, who studies this, becomes free from all the sins. He never gets the impure thought (concerning Bhasma).

24. He gets the virtue of bathing in all the holy waters. He obtains the result of performing all the Vedic Sacrifices. He is honoured by all the gods.

25. He gets an uninterrupted devotion in me, the Lord Nārāyaṇa. He attains the state of Equality of Vishnu, having obtained the pure knowledge.

26. He does never come back to this world, does never come back. Thus Says the Lord Vāsudeva.

27. He who studies this also attains the same. Thus Om, Truth. Thus ends the upanishat.

R. A. S.

---

* In the Srauta Prayoga, we find this mantra uttered with sprinkling the holy ashes, when the dog pollutes the Sacrificial ground by entering it.

MY MASTER'S VOICE.*

General Motto: "Old is the disciple, youthful the Teacher: Silent the Teacher sits and the pupil clears his doubts and finds the World all full of Peace!" is a classical expression cf the "silent teaching" the Master-Soul imparts to the fully-qualified disciple, who has grown old in study and moral discipline, while the Master is overflowing with youthful energy which He imparts to the pupil in the final stages, when he has grown quite receptive to the subtlest vibrations and minutest scintillations of *Thought* and *motif—Afterword to "Gleanings on the Way."* p. 52,

PART I.

THE GURU AND THE ISHTA DEVATA,

(*Karmasanyāsa-Yôga*)

Motto: "Shutting out all external objects, fixing the gaze between the eyebrows, making the *prāṇa* and the *apāna* airs equal, *viz.* restraining the outgoing and incoming breaths which move within the nose, the devotee who has restrained his mind, the senses and the understanding having emancipation as his highest goal, free from desire, fear and anger is emancipatad indeed. Knowing as the Sole Enjoyer of all Sacrifice and Penance, as the Great Lord of all the worlds, as the Friend of all beings, he goes to Peace."—*Bhagavad Gita V- v.* 27-29.

I.

"There is but One only God and Mahomet is His Prophet" is an excellent formula the truth of which deserves to be laid to heart by every spiritual student. "The truth of it" is the *Lakshiartham*—the spiritual meaning of the words constituting the sentence which is a complete idea. The spiritual meaning of a complete idea must necessarily be an ideal—an organic unity of thought and ideas which must be realised in order to be fully understood. Is the understanding to precede

* *All Rights Reserved.*

realisation or to succeed it? The structure of the sentence, the inter-relation of the words to one another as phrase, clause and sentence, and subject, predicate and object must be understood first with the aid of the intellect helped by the purified emotion of an understanding heart. The only theism which counts as a world-force is the theism which aims at "the purification of the human mind." Without this "purifiction of the human mind" the subtlety and keenness of intellect will be of no avail for the right understanding or grasping of an ideal. This "*grasping of the ideal*" is what I call "*the previous understanding*" of the *ideal* to be realised. Reason *alone* cannot understand it. The Intellect as such "is a whore" as Emerson puts it. It must be redeemed from its fallen state: the unsteady and unstable elements in it have to be eradicated and stability of views, and steadiness of application should be imparted to it which will give it the character of constancy and devotion to an ideal, which by itself it is incapable of realisation. It must be purified of its natural and inherent dross. That which raises Man as a "thinking being" above the animal in him is the institution of marriage as a sacrament. For, it catches hold of the emotional centre of Man and Animal, that *something*—call it sentiment, feeling or emotion or any other word you like,—before which both Reason and Instinct stand helplessly transformed into that *something* and make it constant like the Pole Star (*Arundati*) turning to the One Aim in Life viz, constancy to its own choice (which is what we call *Husband*). That which makes *wife* of a *woman* is constancy through life and death to her own choice of partner in life. It is the wife alone (i.e., unchanging constancy to one's first choice) that has the right to become mother. Others may breed children; but cannot become mothers. Even so the intellect may breed thoughts and fancies; but unless it becomes attuned and fixed like a Pole Star in constancy in its relation to the centre of Emotion, it cannot create or make productive thought. Intellect must therefore be wed to the Heart at a sufficiently early stage of its development and that is the reason why

Brahmin children are ordained to be invested with the holy thread (Symbolical of *yagna*, the Law of *Sacrifice*) and initiated into the mysteries of Brahma-Vidya at so early an age as seven to nine years. The Intellect must be trained to work in co-operation with and in constant relation to the Heart, which is the centre of Emotion. Lord Morley said, "All Great thoughts proceed from the heart but they must come round about through the brain:" And he affirmed a great principle of Action (Karma) in that one sentence. The Intellect and the Heart when wedded together in an inalienable bond of Union (which in social life we call the Sacrament of Marriage), and trained to work in co-operation with each other, we lay the foundations deep for that co-ordination of principle and correlation of facts which are the essential bases of harmonious life and growth. Any cleavage between the Intellect and the Heart is bound to produce disastrous results both to the Individual as a unit and the society as a whole. This is a spiritual fact which none can change or alter, but it is left to every one to recognise it or ignore it as one wills; and in doing so that one unconsciously exercises the God-given freedom of choice and elects the path which will lead him to Salvation or damnation in the end as he recognises or ignores the *inexorable fact.*

So much for the essential union of what is conventionally called "the head and the heart."

II.

Now to the *Lakshiartham* or Spiritual meaning of the simple formula which Mahomet framed as the *summum bonum* of all his teachings. "There is but One only God" who is *ever* At Rest; and He has but One Speech (*maunam*) and One Speaker only in His name (*the Son.*) Mahomet claimed to be that One. Jesus again claimed to be that One. And so all the Saints, Sages and Siddhas throughout the world in all ages. There is no inconsistency in all this. God speaks the speech of silence which those who have attained to *at-one-ment* with Him (and become *His Son*), alone can and do rightly understand.

Having understood Him and His *Silent Speech* by *at-one-ment with Him*, they come down from that inaccessible height to interpret the same to striving, struggling, staggering humanity. "There is but One only God who is nameless and formless and One Teacher only who is Śrī *Dakshiṇāmūrty*" is the formula in which the whole doctrine of the eternal Religion of the Hindus can be summarised. All others are but manifestations of this One Supreme Manifestation (as Teacher of the Absolute Truth) in forms and modes as numerable as the status and development of the pupils who yearn to know the Truth and persistently and perseveringly work for it with heart and soul.

But the heart must first be purified and the intellect too. A pure heart ever aims at pure things only. By the Supreme Law of attunement impure thoughts and emotions cannot enter a pure heart. Conversely, impure thoughts and emotions cannot but ultimately taint the heart and sully its purity. So long as man has an outgoing mind, he is brought into necessary contact with the objects of the senses; and the attitude of his Mind (the inner mind which ever dwelleth in the *light* and the *presence* of the Lord) determines the influence of his environment on him as well as his own influence on the environment.

III.

Objects in themselves have no power to influence Man, unless it be by the force which they derive by the attitude of his own Mind towards those objects.

A purified Mind (*Suddha-manas*) rains its own pure influence on the objects of its choice and so purifies it, while an Impure Mind (Asuddha-manas or Kāma-manas), caught in the toils of its own heated imagination, is easily enslaved by the objects and inextricably involved or enmeshed in the subtle and gross attractions of the senses. If there be no mind to act as intermediary, there is no such thing as subject and object: the Soul sees itself reflected in its *upādhi* and knows itself as such. So all the preliminary training and discipline for attaining soul-perception or *Ātmadarisanam* consists in controlling the intermediary which is the Mind. The Science of controlling the

Mind is called Yôga. And *Patañjali*, the author of *Yōga Sūtras* in his very first sutra defines *Yôga* as *Chitta-Vritti-Nirôdhah*." Controlling the modifications of the mind is the greatest of all tasks, and God *alone* can teach in the final stages of this most exacting of all Exact Sciences. One can indeed purify the Intellect by study and devotion and living a life of full research into the world-phenomena both objective and subjective as the quadrette, *Sanaka* and his companions did. But the Lord Dakshiṇāmūrti *alone* and *none else* can teach the art of Stilling the last Emotion of the mind or its tendency to move, and show the apt pupil, the Way to merge himself in Him and *through* Him into "the God At Rest" which is the final realisation!—anything falling short of it is only the gradual climbing of the steep height stage by stage, each stage attained being a *realisation* of that *stage* and not the final realisation and ultimate merging in the Lord God WHO EVER IS AT REST.

If the God EVER IS AT REST, how then doth God manifest as Teacher or Dakshiṇāmūrti? Here then is one of the Greatest paradoxes which is none the less true, however parodoxical it may appear to reason and intellect which are but faculties of the 'finite-infinite' mind. Mind is both finite and infinite because it is but a medium between the subject and the object the seer and the seen, the finite and the infinite. It is in sooth the medium for the manifesting principle of life, ever keeping up the relation of subject and object and setting the Law of Polarity in action. When it mingles with and merges in the Infinite, like a river losing its name and form and other characteristics in the infinite expanse of ocean, it becomes infinite: On the other hand if it goes out through the senses and unites itself with the objects of the senses which it creates, it becomes finite like the object with which it identifies itself by the manifesting principle which indwells it, and from which it draws its motive power. Thus to know the mind, involves a knowledge of the constant modifications of the mind-stuff caused by the thinking-soul within it, which ever thinks "I am"

and acts on that basis. Its thinking "I am" and its acting on that basis, involves a knowledge of its *being* and *becoming*. This is what is called "the Law of Being and Becoming" by which Life manifests itself. This Law by which the unmanifested First Cause manifests itself in names and forms, is what is called Evolution, a word much used but little understood by the thinkers of the West.

IV.

For Evolution implies Involution which they with their outgoing mind and genius for material civilisation are hardly able to understand and realise. They talk of Matter and Spirit; but they never could understand their own mind as to what is Matter and what is Spirit. To know the mind, as I said, is to realise the constant modifications of the mind. To attain to a knowledge of this, Man must be able to realise the three important states of conditioned consciousness which primarily affect the modifications of the mind. These are best described by the technical words: *Kevala*, *Sakala* and *Suddha*.

(1) The *Kevala* or *Kaivalya state* of (pure) consciousness is different from the Kaivalya state of mind which is a condition of consciousness. When the thought-making mind is suppressed, it merges itself in its Cause, the Darkness of Avidya or Ignorance. It becomes a homogeneous mass of darkness or Ignorance. This is the *Kaivalya state* of the Mind.

(2) The *Sakala* or "Creative State" of the conditioned consciousness or mind which has been reduced to a homogeneous mass of dead but plastic material, called the mind-stuff or *Kevala-Chittam*, consists in this homogeneous mass of thought-making material or mind-stuff, being transformed by the heat producing force of Involution into "*the molten-stuff*" which is ready for receiving the impress of 'the Signet"—the creative "I." The creative Soul says: "I am a Signet and I will put my stamp on the 'molten stuff' before it hardens." This it can do only by separating itself from the mind-stuff in which, in the course of Evolution, it has got itself involved by its power of identification or *Tādātmya Sakti*.

(3) The *Suddha* or "witnessing state" of the conditioned consciousness or *Tejo-manas* (Enlightened mind) is a state of consciousness which stands isolated from "the mind-stuff" (*Kevala-Chittam*) and "the molten-stuff" (*Chitta-vritti*) and is able to control both the states above mentioned. This is the state of mind fit for practising Yōga,—the *suddha-manas*, which alone can by obliterating the sense-impressions in the mind and reducing to a homogeneous mass (*Kevala-Chitta*) devoid of any impression, and then preparing it for receiving a given impression from *within*, impervious to outer impressions from the senses, by making a "molten-stuff" of the same by the fire of Tapas (*Tāpasāgni*), effectively controls the outgoing mind and the various modifications which it undergoes to receive sense-impressions.

The *process* is the same whether the impression is made either by the senses or the soul within. The mind-stuff becomes a molten-stuff in both the cases. Only the fire that melts the mind is different.

V.

In the case of sense-impressions from *without*, the molten-stuff is prepared by the fire of lust for the enjoymet of sense objects. While in the case, of the "Signet-impressions" (*Mudrārdham*) from *within*, "the molten-stuff" is prepared by the fire of *tapas* or sense-control—the power of the cultivated will to withdraw the mind from sense-objects and further *abstract* from it the Fire of Energy (Prāṇa) from which it drew its own motive force. Just as ice melts by the withdrawal of the latent heat within it, even so, the mind-stuff melts by the withdrawal of the Prāṇic Energy (*the fire of Prāṇa*) latent in it. This process is called *Prāṇā-Yāma*, as the previous process of sense-control or withdrawing the mind from sense-objects is called *Prtyāhāra*.

The next *process* which purifies the mind (abiding in the abstracted Fire of Prāna) and gives it the "witnessing power" in the *Suddha* state is a threefold one and it is called *Yoga-Samyama* in the technology of Yōga Sastras or *Nichchya*

Jñāna in the technology of Jñāna Sastras. In the former case it consists of the triple process in one, of *Dhāraṇa-Dhyāna-Samādhi*; and in the latter it is called *Sravaṇa-manana-Nitidyāsana* in one which alone gives *certitude* of knowledge.

(i) *Dhāraṇa* and *Sravaṇa* involve the power of fixing the attention absolutely on a given point or subject.

(ii) *Dhyāna* and *manana* involve the power of grasping the point or subject presented thoroughly so as to be able to express it in one's own way or in different ways as the occasion may demand, to make another understand the idea grasped and presented by the student.

(iii) *Samādhi* and *Nitidyasana* involve the power of assimilation of the idea or subject presented in such a way that the knowledge so gained, shall become part and parcel of the student's own self and come to him spontaneously without adventitious aid of mnemonical devices such as *notes, glossaries, recitation etcætera.*

These three processes are the initial points to be gained and they are the most difficult to achieve by the novitiate.

Until the *Novitiate* has successfully scaled these lower heights, he must ever remain a subject *unfit* for initiation into the mysteries of life and any teacher who initiates him into the higher mysteries of life will be doomed to eternal suffering and misery, for he stands guilty, in the eye of the eternal watchers of Dharma (the yoginis of Avaranasakti) of "allowing loaded pistols to be handled by incompetent (and I may add, ignorant) marks-men" who are apt to use it at the slightest provocation—a heinous crime in the eye of the Guardians of Law, be that Law earthly or heavenly (I mean *natural* or *Spiritual*).

VI.

There are three obstacles for the successful achievement of these three necessarily preliminary disciplines. They are *inattention* or carelessness in the first stage; *thoughtlessness* or inefficient power of investigation in the second stage; and uncertitude or the wavering attitude of mind of the Student in the third Stage.

The remedy for the defect in the first stage must be corrected by the disciplinary *Guru* during the stage of character-building or *Gurukulavāsum*. The second defect can be cured only by *Dévata-upāsana* or worship of *Ishta-Dévata*.

The third defect ("wavering attitude of mind") in Saṃādhi or during assimilation of knowledge can be cured only by the companionship of realised souls or *Sat-sangam*, by which is meant, intelligent intercourse and spiritual communion with them in the higher mysteries of Life.

This *wavering attitude* of mind is the most deplorable of all, for, while it heightens the sensibility of the Student, it deprives him of the Peace that he yearns for so much, without having that steadiness of mind which its realisation absolutely requires. The Sruti declares that he who has no certitude of knowledge as to his own realisation is the most abandoned wretch of all. "*Satyam, Satyam, puna-r-satyam, samšyānubhavam gathi nāstih*." That is to say, "Verily, verily, in sooth the wavering-mind (wallowing in doubt) in the process of realisation never reaches the Goal."

These preliminary thoughts I have jotted down for the benefit of those who like the aged and respectable correspondent who has written to me,* has been touched to the quick by the articles which by the Grace of My Guru, I have been contributing to the pages of the Brahmavādin (now collected in book form), who in their commendable zeal to attain to self-realisation declare themselves ready to give up family and all to go and fall at the feet of the *Sat-Guru* who will help them to reach the Final Goal—"the Home of the Lord," there to rest for ever in Peace and Bliss.

Well! I sympathise fully with their zealous watch and noble desire to attain the final Goal and reach the home of the Lord. But I wish to point out to these long-suffering

---

*I request my correspondent to accept this as my answer to his very touching letter, which I very much regret, I cannot, for obvious reasons directly answer. I must wait for the Call and cannot presume it for myself.

long-enduring devotees of God, through their own *Ishta-Devata*, that the Final Goal is not to be reached by merely longing for it, however earnestly, with fleshy desire. They must get rid of their own *karma* first (*Sakala-tyagam* as it is technically called) and for this there is nothing like sticking to one's post of duty be it amongst wife and children or in the midst of forest and wild beasts. That Great Statesman-saint and Sage of the Tamil Land, St. Tāyumānavar says:—

"Oh, Student of the mysteries, Renunciation, internal or external is difficult to realise; whether it be external like that of Pattanattu Pillai, or internal, it is equally great. Make thy choice of either and stick to it. For 'internal' and 'external' are mere names to the realised soul who realises the Truth as one both internally and externally. Immanence and transcendence are distinctions to be observed only in the field of Practice and Sādhana. They are not in ultimate Realisation. Aum Tat Sat.

C. V. S.

Marcus Aurelius.

Keep thyself simple, good, pure, serious, free from affectation, a friend of justice, a worshipper of the gods, kind, affectionate, strenuous in all proper acts. Strive to continue to be such as philosophy wished to make thee. Reverence the gods, and help men. Short is life.

***

He who has seen present things has seen all, both everything which has taken place from all eternity and everything which will be for time without end; for all things are of one kin and of one form.

***

Men exist for the sake of one another. Teach them then or bear with them.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF KARMA.*

सारासारविवेकज्ञा गरीयांसोविमत्सराः ।
प्रमाणतन्त्रास्सन्तीति जिज्ञासाकर्मणःकृता ॥

Karma is act. The whole creation is a mighty stupendous act. The word Creator itself comes from *kri* : to do. Act then proceeds from the Creator. Man is a pro-creator or an agent or actor after the Creator. The Primal Creator is the cause, the कारणन्तुध्येयः of the Upanishats. This is Brahman.

Before we proceed, shall we say we shall take this Brahman as an axiomatic truth? and that if His existence is not demonstrable by means of Perception and Inference, we must have recourse to Revelations? All our arguments on Karma more or less shall have to depend upon our authorities: the Scriptures or Vedas or Sanātana-Dharma; and they will only appeal to those who believe in it, as said in the opening verse.

By our own ratiocination, we may conceive Brahman or the Infinite as in immediate touch with us. If you take the *dravya* (substance) space or time, and try to set limits to either of them in imagination, the mind immediately inquires: what is beyond those walls of limits imagination might so impose? The answer is, there must be a Beyond; again another, and another and so on, it leads to Infinity without stopping. In our Vedāntic terminology, this conception of the Infinite is called *kāla-pariccheda-rahita* and *deśa-pariccheda-rahita*; and there is in addition the *vastu-pariccheda-rahita*, or limits not assignable by any other known object on the Infinite; for it is only a Finite that limits a Finite. The mind again knows that any object contoured by the mind, cannot *ipso facto* be the Infinite. Leave one object and take another; Brahman cannot be that again. Brahman being thus conceived as the Infinite, it is

* A paper read before the 5th conference of Śaiva Siddhānta Mahā Samājam at Rāmnād in December 1910, by A. Govindâchārya Svamin, M.R.A.S., M.R.S.A. ETC.—*Ed. S. D.*

again the Absolute which with Infinite gives the idea of the *Pan-theos* or the *out*-pervading and *Im*-pervading Godhood, the Nārāyaṇa-ic conception.

Instead, however, of every individual mind reasoning out Brahman or Parabrahman in this manner, Revelations whether they be considered as Revelations of a God, or Revelations emanating from the depths of consciousness of God-inspired men, help us to these conceptions, as truths discovered by a long and laborious process of thought, be they of God or of Godly souls,—saints and sages.

But while Revelations possess the value as shown above, Perception and Ratiocination are not at the same time denuded of their true worth in supporting revelational truth. Hence Manu says:—

आर्षंधर्मोपदेशंच वेदशास्त्राविरोधिना ।
यस्तर्केणानुसन्धत्ते सधर्मं वेदनेतरः ॥

The Revelation itself e. g. '*tad vijñāsasva, tad Brahma*' [Taittir: Up.] prompts reason to search Brahman.

Such then are the relative values of the several Means or Instruments of Knowledge or Evidences placed at our disposal for cognition of cosmic categories.

Let us then take Brahman as a necessary (*a priori*) postulate for our deliberations on Karma. Revelations tell us that Brahman is: सत्यंज्ञानमनन्तंब्रह्म i.e., He exists, He is the Will and He is Infinite. Out of this Will there came forth the act (for the Will is the potentiality of act). This Brahman (Creator) willed "let me become many" (बहुस्यांप्रजायेय [Chh-up 6-2-3]).

All creative act is thus preceded by Saṅkalpa or Will. Thus will and act may be said to be the *avyakta* and *vyakta* modes of the same Principle. Act is Will manifested, and Will is Act unmanifested. They are the potential and the kinetic states of the One Eternal Energy—the Brahman.

Now take any periodical creation. Periodical means a time-limit. Was there a time then when any act, like say, creation began? Other religions such as Christianity say that

creation began in time, so that before that time there must have been no act or creation. But our Vedānta philosophy asserts that creation properly is an eternal act, any particular link in the chains of which, called *a* creation, has time-limits covering a certain interval which begins with what is called an act of *sarga* or Differentiation and ending with what is called an act of *prati-sarga* or Integration. Before and beyond such periodical limits, there is necessarily the expanse of the Infinite. Every act therefore is not a spontaneous event, but is an effect preceded by an inevitable Cause, a Law expressed by modern scientific language, as that of the correlation of forces, a law known to our philosophers viz., नकारणात्कार्यसिद्धिः that there can be no effect without a cause—Hence our Revelations declare. धातायथापूर्वमकल्पयत् i.e., When a creative act became manifest, it had its germs in the consummated product of the creative act prior to it. As before, so now ; as now, so again.

Hence Karma or act or its *avyakta* or indiscrete state called Will, is a fact co-terminous with Brahman itself. That is, once when Brahman is admitted as the Infinite, Eternal or Ever-Existent, its will is *ipso-facto* ever-existent with It, and therefore Karma or act, its counterpart is a never-ceasing function of Divinity. This is the subject so well handled by Krishṇa-dvaipayana-Vyāsa in the Brahma-Sūtra:

नकर्म अविभागादितिचेन्ना नादित्वादुपपद्यतेचा प्युपलभ्यतेच ॥

Now comes the Karma or act of man or the *pro*-creator as we have called him, or a creator working after the patterns or models readily provided for him by a Superior Power, a Superior Agent, the Universal Creator or Brahman or Parabrahman. Now unless man existed, or rather Individual soul existed, as a verity conceived as an entity distinct from the Universal Soul or Parabrahman, no individual Karma as differentiated from the Universal Karma of Brahman is possible of consideration. Hence then comes the necessity for predicating a category, called soul, a necessary postulate of existence, which is to be held answerable for all its own circumscribed or limited acts. Our Vedānta tells us again that the act of a soul emanates from

its own will; but both its will and act are contingent on Brahman's will and act. The Individual soul is endowed with a will, which is free, but within circumscribed limits. This power of the will is a delegated power, or what is called दत्तस्वातंत्र्य within the limits of which the soul is free, and from this limited freedom comes the limited responsibility for its acts.

Western philosophy dissects the mind into Intellect, Will or Conation and Emotion. But our wide generic term for all these faculties considered together is *consciousness* or *cognition* (awareness). It is consciousness that moulds itself into any of these forms. And this consciousness is in every atom of the cosmos. Says the Vishṇu-puraṇā, for example, अप्राणिवत्सुस्वल्पासा स्थावरेषुततोऽधिका,— only that this consciousness exists in different *degrees*, not different *kinds*: i.e. तारतम्येनवर्तते in all the several kingdoms of nature, the mineral, the vegetable, the animal, the human, the superhuman and Divine, perfection of Consciousness being predicable of the last alone. Apply to this the thoughts embodied in the recent discoveries of Dr. Bose, viz of the so-thought-of non-living metals possessing consciousness and responding to stimulus, like any other so-called living thing.

The series in the manifestations of consciousness culminating in *Karma* or act, are briefly explained by our Āchāryas in a verse :—

आदावीश्वरदत्तएवपुरुषस्स्वातन्त्र्यशक्त्यास्वयं तत्तद्दशनचिकीर्षणप्रयतनान्युत्पादयन्वर्तते ।
तत्रोपेक्ष्यततोनुमत्याविदधत्तन्निग्रहानुग्रहौ तत्तत्कर्मफलंप्रयच्छतिपुनःसर्वस्यपुंसोहरिः ॥

Now this verse gives also the relation between Individual Karma and Universal Karma, or the Karma or act of the Individual as related to the Universal. For a moment take it also as a postulate that inasmuch as Parabrahma is Infinite, His Will co-terminous with him; and time is another Verity, infinite also in its nature, the soul is also co-terminous with Brahman. *Now then at any point of time, we have the* Individual with a will pregnant with a fund of Karma, all by virtue of being a grant or delegation made to him by Brahman; and that within the limits of delegacy, the Individual is free.

imposed on another by tradition, and as if that confers on one any enviable distinction, prestige or privilege. Introduce if you please at once the class system as obtains in Western lands and be happy if that measure really confers happiness, but those who have witnessed the Western society under the class-system as for instance our England and America-returned brothers, have, judging from their utterances, no good account unfortunately to give to us of that system. Comparing the one with the other, both native as well as foreign opinion is, strange to say, veering round to favour our caste-system. For an example of foreign opinion read what Abbe Dubois, Havell, Monier Williams, Sir Henry Cotton, W. H. Hunter, Marquis de la Mazalier, Sister Nivedita and others have expressed, and also watch the anxiety of our foreign-returned brothers to get back into their own fold. Mrs. Annie Besant's oft-repeated wish to be born as a Brāhṁan in her next birth is significant as having a bearing on the caste question, though to all intents and purposes, she is in spirit Brahman, and she can afford to wait for the Saṁskāras or Sacraments which our Sāstras reserve for particularly produced bodies, the *Pākajas*, as the technical term goes. That this question is being discussed in all its bearings just now all over our country, especially in its relation to sea-voyage, is a matter for congratulation. Long ago did we express our opinion that *Parishads* should be constituted and new Nibandhanas or Nirṇayas according to the spirit and requirements of the age brought into vogue and to this natural work the recognized pontificates of our country should earnestly set to work shaking off their lethargy for the nonce. To return from the digression. All these Karmas or Dharmas, be they *sāmānya*, general, or *Visesha*, special or particularised, are acts prescribed which in some form or other mankind is impelled to do under eternal physical and moral laws.

All the Karmas or acts to be done, each according to his position or status in life, status in society, and in relation to the result which he wishes to achieve, all come under good or

vidhi-Karmas. The bad or the *nishedas* are totally eschewed by their very nature and do not therefore at all enter into our deliberations here. For it is written :—

यश्शास्त्रविधिमुत्सृज्य वर्ततेकामकारतः ।
नससिद्धिमवाप्नोति नसुखंनपरांगतिम् ॥

In order to elucidate our subject further, we have here only to consider the good Karmas, viz; those enjoined by the *Sāstras* such as:

तस्माच्छास्त्रंप्रमाणंते कार्याकार्यव्यवस्थितौ ।
ज्ञात्वाशास्त्रविधानोक्तं कर्मकर्तुमिहार्हसि ॥

We shall only broadly again consider the two great divisions of the good *Karmas* viz the *Pravṛitti* and the *Nivṛitti*. *Pravṛitti* means embarking for, and *Nivṛitti* means debarking from. In other words, *Pravṛitti Karmas* may be called the interested acts, and *Nivritti Karmas* the disinterested acts. The interested acts bind the man or soul to its interests, (i.e.,) results. This lands it into a state called *Samsāra* or bondage or *formal* existence; whereas the disinterested acts free it from bondage, and lead it to *moksha* or redemption, or what may be called *spiritual* existence, the antinomial to the *formal*.

Now as explained before, Will leads to Act, and Act to manifest itself requires a vehicle or medium. Act manifestable by a medium and in a sensible manner requires an organized structure which in our case is what is called body with senses and all. Now the body that we may at any moment happen to possess is the resultant of a long evolution; and to evolution then belongs our doctrine of many births, or re-births or re-incarnations. Here is evident the nexus between *Karma* and *Janma*.

Pravṛitti or interested acts must bring on experience or enjoyment; and enjoyment of the results of acts is only possible by a three-fold objectivity. This threefoldness is *Bhogya Bhogopakaraṇa* and *Bhogasthāna*. *Bhogyas* are the objects of enjoyments; *bhogopakāraṇas* are the instruments of enjoyment, which are this body, its senses &c., *bhogasthānas* are the localities where objects are enjoyed. This triad is of the material or

formal evolution as contra-distinguished from the spiritual. Here we come to the conception of matter, a Postulate or Verity without a consciousness of its own, but is that which is capable of being fashioned out into myriads of wonderful objects for the enjoyment of a conscious entity. The conscious ,entity is the spiritual entity or the soul, and the unconscious the material non-ego. They are also designated by the terms *the self* and the *non-self* or *ātmā* and *anātma*, the subject and the object, the *pratyak* and *parāk*, the *Jñāta* and the *Jñeya*, the knower and the known, and so forth. Once more we are here driven to seek enlightenment from Revelations which tell us that the material entity as well as the spiritual entity are both beginningless :—

अजामेकांलोहितशुक्लकृष्णां बह्वींप्रजांजनयंतींसरूपाम् ।
अजोह्येकोजुषमाणोनुशेते जहात्येनांभुक्तभोगामजोन्य: ॥ [Svet-Up. iv 5.]

We have then, a Trinity of eternals, but mark that two of them, soul and matter periodically emerge into manifestation and merge into unmanifestation, whereas no such thing is, *en hypothese* predicable of the *Parabrahman*. We have thus a Parabrahman or Paramātman, the great universal Actor but whose act is disinterested ; a Jivātman, the conditional actor whose intersted acts fix him to the fruits of those acts, pleasurable or painful, and bind him therefore to matter, which takes the orgainzed form of a body and a big body as it were in the form of the objective universe. A hedonist may here humourously hint in the manner of the Asura in Gitā अपरस्परसंभूतं किमन्यत्कामहैतुकं [xvi-8] i.e., that this body is no more than the product brought about by the sexual union of a father and a mother; but our quick retort to this hint is that that union itself is a *Karma* or an act for the happening of which, many prior causes conspire, which are quite in the domain of the unconscious as far as the couple's understanding reaches. To return, interested act or Karma begets fruit. The enjoyment of that fruit is through material objects, for which an orgainzed body is the primary requisite. The shaping of this body is in the hands of the Lord, as He is the Watcher and Rewarder as shown in the opening paras.

This question Sri Vyāsa considers in the Brahma Sūtra: फलमतउपपत्तेः [iii-2. 37].

The *Sāṅkhyan* dualism denies boldly that any Superior Lord is at all required in the Scheme of the Kosmos; for Karma "Works" may determine all results. This is also the ground taken by the *Pūrva-Mīmāmsakas.* But according to Vedānta, *Karma* is *jaḍa* or *achetana,* i.e. lifeless; again its dictum is that the soul which performs the *Karma* finds its own efforts insufficient for salvation. Hence Brahman or a Superior Lord becomes a necessary postulate, and it is He who grants the fruits of acts. Hence फलमतउपपत्तेः as Ṥrī Vyāsa lays down.

Thus then, the more interested the acts are that a soul performs, the more will it be associated with matter, but the more those acts are of a disinterested character, the more is it severed from such company on the one hand, and on the other hand the more near does it approach the Lord, Parabrahman, the Pure Spirit. Matter or *Prakṛiti* is called *avyakta* and Srī Krishṇa says:

क्लेशोऽधिकतरस्तेषा मव्यक्तासक्तचेतसाम् ।
अव्यक्ताहिगतिर्दुःखं देहवद्भिरवाप्यते ॥ [Gi. xii. 5] but those who
येतुसर्वाणिकर्माणि मयिसन्न्यस्यमत्पराः......तेषामहंसमुद्धर्ता मृत्युसंसारसागरात् ॥
[Gi. xii. 6.]

Those who are attached to *avyakta* reap suffering, but those who seek Me are delivered.

There is then such a division made in Sāstras as *Pravṛitti karmas* and *Nivṛitti karmas* whose nature has been shown; but the *Pravṛitti* karmas also partake of the nature of *Nivritti karmas,* the same *Sâstras* again tell us, *if* only there be a change in the motive thereof. Finally it amounts to this that *Pravṛitti karmas* done as duty, or as Worship of God, are no more so but become *Nivṛitti.* For example it is written in the Bhagavat-gītā: यज्ञार्थात्कर्मणोन्यत्र लोकोयंकर्मबन्धनः [iii-9] That act ***binds*** which is not of the character of *Yajña* or Worship. This is the burthen of the celestial song or the "Philosophy of Karma" taught in the Gītā; and it is again the topic discussed by what known as the विनियोगपृथक्त्वन्यायः of the *Pūrva-Mīmāmsakas.*

Pravritti as such is thus the inexorable Law of *Necessity*, but *Nivritti*, or *Pravritti* in its changed aspect of *Nivritti*, is also by parity of reasoning the inexorable Law of *Freedom*.

Parenthetically we may observe that many understand the Gitā as a Philosophy of Quietism or entire cessation from work ; and this opinion has a tendency to lead man to indolence and helplessness and fosters the notion of a blind dependency on deity. But that the teachings are quite the reverse may be shown by many large citations. It is enough for me however to draw attention to only one passage here, where Śri Krishṇa says in his *Vibhūti-Vistara* Chapter : शब्दः मे पौरुषंनृषु i. e., 'All that is known as strenuous effort in man is myself'. The lazy man then who does not put the God-given body and mind to the use they are intended for is not a Bhakta indeed. He can certainly not be a godly man. Sure he displeases Krishṇa the Teacher and Master; and when the Master is displeased, one may well fancy what the consequences of that displeasure may be.

Well then, we have come to the *Nivritti Dharmas*, or *Nivritti Karmas*, in this two-fold characteristics ; viz., *Nivrittis* definitely so known and enjoined in the *Śāstras* as such and *Nivrittis* which *Pravrittis* become by a change in the *motif*. The ultimate of this *Nivritti-Karma* is Divine-Worship. Divine-worship is the acme of all moral virtues. If the verses be read beginning from अमानित्वमदंभित्वं अहिंसाक्षान्तिरार्जवम् in the Gitā [xiii], the ultimate or culmination of all *karma* is pointed out to us as : मयिचानन्ययोगेन भक्तिरव्यभिचारिणी.

This leads us to a consideration of Worship, for worship is the highest *Nivritti-Karma* for a soul, if he is a *Mumukshu*, i.e., he who wishes to dissociate himself from matter and reach Spirit, i. e. the universal Spirit, Parabrahman. Now, worship is not only a science, but is an art as well, and has much rationale about it.

According to the psychological datum or fact यन्मनसाध्यायति तद्वाचावदति तत्कर्मणा करोति, Worship must first be born in the mind

and ripen in the heart of the person. The exuberance of this mental-hearty worship finds its expression in speech, and this worship by speech is further enhanced in effect by the bodily deed. Man is thus a triply constituted being: of mind, speech, and deed; and all these several organs desire to unite in worship, and this united desire cannot be confined to the one or the other partner of the union without detriment to the general interests of all. Worship mental, is no doubt the dominant factor; but the verbal and the manual are accessories and are very faithful servants quite deserving of impressment into the service of worship.

The service of Worship depends on the fundamental belief in the triad of Postulates, viz., the Worshipper,—soul,—the Worshipped,—God or Parabrahman, – and Worship, the highest *nivṛitti-karma* or transaction subsisting between the two, Worshipper and Worshipped. Worship by definition depends again on two fundamentals, viz, that the Worshipped ought to be a Personal or Saguṇa-God, endowed with as many auspicious attributes as only the Infinite can be so endowed; the 2nd fundamental being that that worship is for the interests of the soul, for if worship leads to salvation that salvation is for the soul and not for the body with which the soul happens to be temporarily associated. The body is corrupt and has apparently, apart from its informing soul, no craving for salvation. Hence the idea of salvation is only for the soul who believes in itself (i.e. soul) as a distinct entity from the body with which it may be, though in such intimate, union. The *Science* of worship then depends on these basic principles. It has no existence for him who has no faith in those principles. To the believer or the convinced of these four fundamentals, there is the Science of worship, which is an act of the highest devotion of the mind and heart, aided by speech and deed. The *Science* consists in that the soul has a desire to extricate itself out of the trammels of matter or bondage known as *samsāra*, and reach a state of bliss and blessedness of an everlasting nature; in other words, join Parabrahman.

Whether when the soul reaches Brahman, both merge ; whether it be the soul that mergeth in Brahman or Brahman mergeth in the soul; whether it be that in this merging the soul vanisheth, or Brahmanhood be usurped by the soul, are matters which need not now distract us. The end of it all may be *Kevalādvaita Šuddhādvaita, Visuddhādvaita* or any other species of Advaita, conceived by man. But instead of wasting the small but precious term of life in wrangling about these subtleties and racking the brain about metaphysics, time is better employed by letting the heart quietly speak to the soul. If the heart melts into worship, let no metaphysics sin in restraining it. Brain-speculation has certainly its own value, but if it runs riot and kills love between man and man and man and God, it ought anon to be curbed. There is a solidarity in humanity which the heart bespeaketh, whichsoever sort be the Advaita one may profess ; we are all agreed in that that One Brahman is आनन्द. So says the Šruti 'आनन्दंब्रह्मेतिव्यजानात्' 'रसोवैसः' In giving liberty to the mind, let the heart not get strangled. In allowing the heart to well up in emotion, let not mind again be enslaved. Let the two work harmoniously together. Philosophy comes of the one, but religion comes of the other, and it has been a trite saying with us all that the one is the handmaid of the other. If the soul is weary of embodied existence and wishes to give it up and gain a spiritual or Godly existence, the Way or the Science of worship is this ; but is not for that soul which is self-satisfied, which in philosophical language is the state of *kaivalya* or the State Isolate, or isolate from God.

Now comes the *Art* of worship. Mere science or a theory of Science is dry and is of little *practical* value to mankind. All our worldly concerns become a success only by virtue of its practicality. He is a man of mere theories, not a practical, utilitarian man, you would say and dismiss him perhaps summarily as a visionary. But when theory is applied to practice, mankind welcomes it.

Apply this principle to the Science or Theory of worship. The practicality of any science consists in its art. The many

practical Institutions we find on earth, the Churches, the Mosques, the Temples, the Behrams and so forth are but illustrations of man's instinct of worship reduced to, and finding expression in, art. Worship, we said, is threefold, mental, verbal, manual. If the mere Science satisfies the mental, Art is wanted to satisfy the cravings of the verbal and the manual. The art of speech displays itself in literature and poetry, the art manual expresses itself in painting and sculpture. Out of the exuberance and ebullition of a soul's love for its divine Lord, Father, Mother, Spouse and what not, Art takes its rise, and expresses itself in praise and not satisfied with that, accompanies it with gesture. No spiritual statesman should therefore forget these fundamental conditions of the art of worship, when he is called upon to minister to the worshipping instincts of man over whom he may for the time being be called to rule. Abuses do certainly creep in, but such abuses are to be found in all departments of human concerns. The wise statesman's duty is therefere to try to remove the abuses, but never to destroy the Institution itself. The wise gardener applies the shears to the overgrowth, not to the root. The wise barber shaves the hair, never skims the scarp. The wise statesman spiritual, then, comes to fulfil, not to destroy.

Now in the same way that mind, speech and body unite in worship, the larger man,—mankind—wishes to congregate for communal worship. This instinct cannot be met but by Temples and such other popular Institutions and soul-inspiring rituals, connected therewith. Temples are wanted ; dispensing with them altogether would be a national catastrophe. The Institute is necessary, but how to have one in all its requisites of purity and beautiful art, how to effect reforms in ritual and management and where to apply remedies in the existing, perhaps out of date, organism and function, is what must form the most anxious, arduous as well as delicate care of a ruler over men, ruler not only over their persons, but over their minds and hearts as well,—ruler not only over their material, but over their spiritual well-being.

Mental or Spiritual worship is the dominant indeed, without which the verbal and the manual are useless and lifeless, but with which, as the scientific, they constitute the art which gives it all the Beauty of Name and Form, the naming coming from the Speech and the Forming coming from the Deed. The Science is but the kernel, whereas the Art is all the beautiful demonstation clustering round it. The Art of worship is so to say the *Vibhava* or *Vaibhava* of the Science, in the relation of the beautiful phenomena of the universe to its central Noumnon or the substratum of the sum of existence, called God. If a father celebrates the marriage of his son or daughter, the mere science of it consists in repeating a few Vedic mantras. This is done in no time, but you find men actually not satisfied with this dry and grey 10 minute's formality. They wish to enhance the effect of the event by grand demonstrations, and demonstrations on a large scale. They begin with their ever-green pandal before their mansion, and go through a series of *fetes* and parties, for 5 days and 10 days and a month together, finishing up with processions and illuminations and what not. Supposing then a man is found who loves his Lord God more than his son or daughter? What all will he not do for his Lord! consider for a moment. The spiritual statesman had better take care therefore how he may manœuvre with the delicate question concerning the cravings of the human heart. The secrets of the human heart, a connoiseur alone kens. The outbursts of the heart in thought and speech are never a theme for his suppression or repression, but is a constant psychological problem to direct, and divert, if need be, into useful channels. If an oppresser takes the field in this respect, he becomes unblessed by unblessing the instincts of the oppressed. Man, he must know, is never satisfied with vacuities and abstractions. As he is constituted, he wants *discretes* (*vyakta*) and concretes. A wise statesman spiritual therefore knows how tactfully to minister to these promptings of the human heart.

We have shown in what the Science and Art of worship consists. But what is the rationale of worship? In this act of

worship what part do Images play? What are Images, again, are they dead or living? This question depends upon some fundamental ideas. The 1st Idea is that of God and his Over-pervasive and Im-pervasive character. His Pervasion again, our Scriptures say, is of two sorts, pervasion for the performance of the function of sustaining being. This is called सामान्याधिष्ठान. The other kind is pervasion or Divine *Presence*, for the sake of the Worshipper, in any object the worshipper may lovingly choose. This is called विशेषाधिष्ठान. *Sāmānya* is *general*, and *Viśesha* is *special*, manifestation of the Deity or the Divine. This is beautifully expressed by an allegory:—

श्रीशस्यसर्वाधिष्ठानं दारुवह्निवदीरितम् ।
विष्णोर्विशेषाधिष्ठानमयःपिण्डाग्निवन्मतम् ॥

I.e., "The general presence of God is like the heat, latent in a piece of wood; whereas His special presence is like the visible fire of a heated iron ball." To those who believe in Krishṇa, and therefore in the Gītā passage:—

अवजानंतिमांमूढाः मानुषींतनुमाश्रितम् ।
परंभावमजानन्तो ममाव्ययमनुत्तमम् ॥ [ix-11.]

from which it is clear that though Krishṇa's body was made of divine or Spiritual stuff, He chose out of His own condescension, to descend on earth and make that body visible to material eyes. If this is believable, then the other is not difficult of belief, viz., the *special* presence of divinity in a stock or stone or in flesh or bone, or any substance in creation. But to those who discard such *Pramāṇas* or authorities, the argument possesses no value. This was the hypothesis on which the opening verse of this paper started.

It may, we say *enpassant*, here be suggested that Krishṇas or Rāmās are after all mythical personages. But what we say is, mythical or no, they have come to live with us permanently, and have struck a deep root in our hearts and have taken such a sentimental possession of the popular imagination, that it seems useful to foster that national spirit abiding with us. If these traditional bequests are worth having and harbouring,

then we must have them; but if not, their worthlessness or their unworthiness, as the case may be, has to be conclusively demonstrated to the consciousness of the Hindus before they can altogether be ostracised from the country.

Granting Images then, or Idols as some may prefer to name them, we say, we do not worship the mere Idol, but the Idea embodied by it and underlying it. Ours is *Devatārādhana*, not *Vigrahārādhana* as the missionary is pleased to stricture it. And then even the External Symbol, the Idol is not a meaningless form to us. For the Idol to us is the miniature of the Infinite. As our mind is not capable or capacious enough to grasp the infinite within its small compass, and craves yet for the very Infinite to be presented to it in finite forms for convenience of worship, the significant symbols *are* granted. Our Image is a miniature embodiment of cosmic truths. Here is a beautiful verse to the point: चेतश्चक्रति, चेतनासि, रमतिस्तत्संवृतिर्मालिका, भूतानिस्वगुणै रहंकृतियुगं शङ्खनशार्ङ्गयते । पाणाःखानिदशापि कौस्तुभमणिर्जीवः, प्रधानंमनः श्रीवत्सं कमलापते तवगदामाहुर्महान्तंबुधाः ॥

Hence we had better not do away with the Idols that are warrants of religion. If you calmly think over the matter, the universe is full of Idols; and there is no such thing as an abstraction. Philosophers may think mental worship is sufficient, and that worship need not therefore be a concrete affair. But both these positions are untenable in the face of our experience. Let any philosopher appeal to his own Conscience as to what his mental abstract worship is, and he will find it a mere negation. Besides what may be good and sufficient for a philosopher——and after all philosophers are very few—is not sufficient to meet the wants of the populace, and in his attempts to make every one a philosopher instead of trying to be a real philosopher by being able to accommodate himself to many minds and many hearts which think differently from him, we are afraid he will fail; and again if he cares for himself, and is either antagonistic or indifferent to larger interests, he becomes selfish. That is a real philosopher who knows how not to tamper with, and at the same time how to be able to

minister to, the secret as well as sacred wants of many men. Certainly there are essentials, but they are mere essentials. But externals are also a necessity of our existence. For instance fancy what would be the essential monarch and what his essential work would be, if he had not his external faithful servants to attend upon him and aid him in his work? So do speech and deed stand to thought. Essentials are indeed agreed upon on all hands, but in the very nature of our constitution, in the nature of how the world round us is constituted, we dare not despise or dispense with the externals.

Again our Temples and Idols and all such Institutions are our strongholds of memorial, viz of our philosophy and religion, which after all are those which survive the human monuments of ephemeral interest. With their destruction and disappearance, a nation is eradicated, and a race is extinguished. The Temples *etc.*, are again our only embodiments of hoary palæontology and living transmitters of traditions and cherished associations. There is so much national sentiment again nestling round them. It is the one abode which in sorrow it seeks as its refuge. Again, when in these days it has become the fashion with men to daily raise statues to *men*, standing statues of our *gods* ought, I think, to be allowed to remain intact. I should stay the hand of the vandal and the iconoclast before he may succeed entirely to raze our national institutions by means fair or foul, and before our Rāmās and Krishṇas are regarded as devils possessing men, not as God descended on earth. This is the fact of Incarnation which other nations also admit. Believe in it or not as you may please, there is no reason for hate or ire against allowing their statues, as statues of heroes at least, to remain and gladden the heart of the nation? Even a Mr. Hooper of new york lecturing on Bahaism has the good sense to know and to state that Krishṇa is not a myth, not a mere hero, but God manifest as the Logos (see 4 and 7 of his lecture delivered on the 6th April 1907 in the rooms of the Bengal Social Club). Are Hindus now trying to deny a thing which even an outlandish Theosophy has found many reasons to

admit? Let the *avatāra*, be of God, or demigod, hero or saint, and yet it "quickeneth the flagging currents of holiness and rightousness from age to age." We must now sum up.

Creation is a great Karma or act and man is given a small though responsible share in it. And his act is either reward-bearing or redemption-bearing. The purpose of creation is salvation for all in the End; and this becomes the *Nivritti-Karma* or *Dharma*, when done without motive. At the crest of all *Nivritti-Karma* stands worship. If *Karma* is beginningless from its *pravritti* aspect, its fruit is endless from its *Nivritti* aspect. For Karma now partakes of the nature of Divine worship, which is Service to God, endless, for moksha or final deliverance is by hypothesis endless. The *Pravritti-Karma* has *pradhvams-âbhāva*, but the *Nivritti-Karma* has *prāg-abhāva* only and becomes *Nitya* when once its destiny is reached.

The orgainzed body that is given to us in the scheme of creation is intended for worship and for no other purpose. It is to be so used, not abused. So says a holy verse:—

विचित्रादेहसंपत्तिरीश्वरायनिवेदितुम् ।
पूर्वमेवकृताब्रह्मन् हस्तपादादिसंयुता ॥

This wonderful body with its wonderful mechanism is given to man for offering it to Him who gave it. So exclaims a Vedic Sage in the Taittiriya Samhita देववीतयेत्वांगृह्णामि "O body! I wear thee that I may please Him with thee. The body then has got a *pravritti* aspect as well as a *nivritti* aspect of Karma. Let men profit by it. One of our ācharyas has beautifully embodied the foregoing thoughts in two verses which I simply repeat and stop:—

क्लेशत्यागकृतेऽर्पितेनकरणव्युहेनदेहेनच स्वानर्थंबतजन्तुरार्जयतिचेन्मन्तुर्नियन्तुःकुतः ।
शस्त्रेशत्रुजयायनैजगुरुणादत्तेऽथतेनैवचेत् पुत्रोहन्तिनिजंवपुःकथयतेतत्रापराधीतुकः ॥
शास्त्रंभूरिनिजस्वरूपमतयेस्वाराधनार्थंवपुः स्वध्यानायमनश्चशुद्धिमनघांलब्धुंचतीर्थादिकम् ।
तत्वान्यप्युपदेष्टुमुत्तमगुरून्दत्वानुगृह्णातिसन्स्संसारेतदपिभ्रमेम्यदिकिंकुर्वीतसर्वेश्वरः ॥

A. G.

THE ADVAITA PHILOSOPHY.

(*Continued from page 312 of No. 7 Vol. XII.*)

THE THEORY OF ILLUSION.

Now to come to the question of illusion:—In the case of any illusion, three factors are essential. In the first place the object seen, secondly the illusory form in which it is seen and thirdly a sentient being who so sees it. Now, in the case of the Jagat, it is said that God is the object seen, and that the Jagat and the souls in it are the illusory forms in which God is so seen—and now comes the third question--which is the sentient being who so sees? That is to say which is the object illuded? Is it God Himself? Surely He cannot be said to be subject to any illusion, and besides, He is said to be the object seen. Then who is it that is so illuded? Is it the souls? that will be inconsistent. Souls are one of the illusory forms in which God is seen. So that there must be some other object so to see it. A seer and a thing seen are quite different and distinct objects, and I am sure there need not be any difficulty in understanding this. Suppose that a piece of rope is mistaken for a snake; who is it that commits the mistake? Is it the snake, itself—the illusory form in which the rope is seen? This is absurd!—and this is the argument put forward by our Māyāvāda friends! No illusion is possible without some one to be illuded, and to say that illusion itself is the object of that illusion is a contradiction in terms. Because, an illusion forebodes an object to be illuded which should necessarily be something other than the illusory form; and in the absence of such an object, there could be no illusion. We know that illusion is caused by the defective intelligence of the object illuded, and if the illusion in this case is said to be the cause of the object illuded,—including its defective

intelligence,—we will have to argue that a cause is produced by its effect! A more absurd theory you cannot imagine!

We will consider another aspect of this illusion. Illusion is only a mistaken view. Can this view be said to possess any rationality in itself? An illusory form is in fact a nothing—a zero—it has no real existence. It is only a mistaken view of a weak-minded or a defective being. Can this nothing be said to possess intelligence and commit mistakes, as the illusory souls are explained to do? Surely this is beyond comprehension.

It may be argued that the intelligence itself is an illusion; but that there is an illusion is a fact, and I am only speaking of this fact. A fact can only be realised by a factor, and not by an illusory or imaginary form. Which is that factor that experiences this illusion? If it is the illusion itself, I say that it is not only not a factor, but, as an illusion, it cannot be expected to have intelligence.

Now let us go further and consider another aspect of this Illusion theory. If all the phenomena are illusion, and not real, in any sense, why should we trouble ourselves for liberation or Mukti? What is liberation? Liberation of whom? Liberation of phantoms? Why should we break our head for phantoms that have no existence in reality? Will it not be madness to arrange a campaign for the salvation of phantoms and illusory phenomena? It may be said that the campaign is to remove the illusion; but in whose interests I ask? Is it in the interest of any real entity? If it be in the interests of phantoms, will it not be the height of folly to attempt at seeking relief for such phantoms? And who is it on the removal of the illusion, that will be benifited by the removal? None. There will be no one left. Why then break our head and fight with shadows?

It may perhaps be said that though phantoms we are, we are subject to the miseries of the world by our mistaking the same for reality, and that it is to remove this state of things, the removal of illusion is sought. I will come presently to the question whether the removal of this illusion or its continuance

is better. But if we are phantoms, if all our sufferings are illusions and whatever we may think of it is all an illusion, what real benefit will accrue by the removal of the illusory sufferings and illusory thoughts of phantoms? It may be that we do not realise that we are phantoms. But what of that? we are phantoms in reality; and what is the use of any realization by phantoms? And if God or His sublime presence His gracious influence is supposed to help us in expelling this illusion, He may be charged with doing or causing to be done a perfectly useless act—and this would be blasphemy again!

Our Māyāvāda friends might perhaps say that the souls ought not to be considered in the light of phantoms, but that they are little sparks of God that have been affected by this illusion owing to the influence of Māyā over them. But I am sure that they will not press this argument, with any amount of seriousness about them. Would they dare contend that any spark of God, however small it may be, will be affected by any amount of Māyā or any amount of illusion? It will be an unpardonable blasphemy to say so, and I do not think that they will blaspheme the great God in order to maintain their pet theory.

I know that in their anxiety to maintain their slippery ground, the Māyāvādins hop up from one argument to another, but could not find a firm footing anywhere. When they find it impossible to reconcile their pantheistic doctrine with their illusion theory, they come out with another story that what is deluded is only the *Jīvātma* behind which is the *Paramātma* unaffected by any illusion. This is only a repetition of the same thing in another form. What is Jīvātma? I ask. Is it a reality or a phantom? If it is a reality, then, there is no doubt, that there are two entities—God and Soul. If it is a phantom, why trouble about phantoms, I ask?

There is another aspect of this theory of illusion, which, if carried to its legitimate end will fall nothing short of the Buddhist theory of annihilation. The Māyāvādins say that all our woes and throes are the result of this illusion, and that

unless this illusion is removed there will be no end of those woes and throes. Although the souls themeselves are the result of this illusion, according to their doctrine, yet so long as this illusion continues, the illusory souls will be subject to the illusory woes and throes, and when the illusion is removed and the truth realized, all miseries will come to an end, and along with them, the illusory souls too. That is to say, when the truth is realized, there will not be any illusory form of any kind, much less any illusory soul. Well, gentlemen, apart from the absurdity of the theory of illusion in its other aspects, I will ask you to consider it in a utilitarian point of view, whether the removal of such an illusion, if it is actually an illusion, is desirable at all. I will ask you to consider which is better—whether to lead a life mixed up with pain and pleasure, as we do in this world, or to be swept out of existence altogether? Would you not think, that the souls, though phantoms they may be, would do well to continue their existence in this illusion, rather than become extinct altogether by the removal of that illusion? I think as men of common sense, you would certainly prefer life to death.

But I know that our Māyāvāda friends will not admit the fallacy of their doctrine even in the face of such arguments. I have had some experience of their mode of reasoning, and they are no doubt experts in confusing the mass. They may now come out with the same story again and say "No, no, we do not say that the souls will be annihilated; but what we say is that their illusion will be removed and that they will be able to realize that they are God Himself". This is treading the same ground over again. If they are God, there is the formidable objection "How could God be subject to illusion"? If they are souls, then the existence of souls must be admitted. If they say that the souls are not realities but phantoms, then we have come to the same ground again, the fallacy of which I have already exposed.

These incongruities will clearly shew that the real truth expounded by our ancient philosophy is not that we are

illusory forms nor are we God, but that we are real entities in non-dual relation with the great God, and that, when we realize the truth, we will lose all our individuality—all our I'ness and My'ness—and merge into the sublime grandeur of the Divine Spirit. This was what Buddha meant by *Nirvāṇa*, and this was what Vyāsa meant by *advaita* in his Vedānta Philosophy. Of course in course of time, their real meanings were distorted and presented in a form entirely different from what was originally intended. That the Māyāvādins themselves realized the necessity of admitting the existence of souls would be quite apparent from the numerous references made to those souls in the Sāstras of that school, where they are clearly defined as immortal and eternal and as subjects of true realization. It is therefore absurd on their own saying to call these souls either as God ar as phantoms. I must not pass over another attempt of theirs at reconciliation. Surely they cannot withstand the force of the arguments used against them, nor are they willing to admit their fallacy. They therefore try various excuses one after the other, but they fail miserably in each and every one of them.

When they find that their illusory souls are no good, they say that the illusion does not create souls, but that owing to the illusion of Māyā the unchangeable God appears as many souls. This is the same repetition again! To whom does He appear so is my question? Is it to Himself? No, certainly not. Is it then to the souls? This can neither be: because there are no souls. Then to whom? It must be to the illusory souls of whose fate I need not say any more.

Now gentlemen, I will point out to you another glaring absurdity in this connection. The theory is that God and Māyā are the material causes of the illusion. If that be so, so long as these causes continue, the illusion also must continue as a matter of course; and I fail to see any use in our endeavour to get over this illusion. The souls do not contribute any quota to the cause of this illusion, because they are only the result of that illusion; and how could this illusion be removed, while its two

material causes are there permanently? There is an object, and in its presence there is a mirror, and there should necessarily be a reflection. How is it possible to do away with the reflection without removing the one or the other cause? It may perhaps be said that by getting over the influence of Māyā, we could get over this illusion. But how is this possible? We, the souls are the effect of Māyā, and how could an effect get over the influence of its cause? How could a shade get over the Influence of the tree?

Now let us for a moment consider the purpose of this illusion. It is contended that God is the only Being, and that there is no other being but God. It would certainly be a pertinent aad rational question then to ask, why should God produce this illusion? We know that illusion is something contrary to truth, and it will be wrong to say that it is a sort of deception. And are we to say that God practises this deception as a pastime, because, mind you, there is no one but God to be benefited or affected by this illusion? Can we say, with any sense of consistency in us that the great God, the fountain-head of perfect goodness, unfathomable wisdom and absorbing love, produces this illusion for his own amusement?

It may be said that God is not responsible for this illusion but it is only the imperfection of the souls that causes this illusion. But have we not been told that the souls themselves are the effect of this illusion? And my question is, why should this illusion be caused whereby the souls are produced and made to suffer by that illusion? Surely a Being that is the source of all these illusions and the innumerable evils and miseries that are consequent thereon cannot be said to be infinitely good. It may be that these evils and miseries are only illusions and not realities, but then the fact remains thatthere are evils and miseries in an illusory form, and this cannot be denied.

I know that the responsibility of this illusion is at times thrown on Māyā. But what is Māyā? It is only a non-intelligent object whose nature God knows well, and which is fully under the control of God. And such a Māyā cannot be

expected to produce anything without the will of God. And why did God produce this illusion? is the question before us. I will come to the question of Māyā shortly, but I must tell you here that according to the Māyāvāda doctrine, there should be no other object than God, and the responsibility of illusion must therefore be fully thrown on God, and I do not think that it will be possible with any one to explain this anomaly.

I know that when this strong argument is raised against the theory of illusion, the Māyāvādins resort to a very lame excuse and say that conditioned as we are we cannot question the action of the unconditioned God. With all deference to the memory of the late Svāmi Vivekananda whose name your society bears, I must say that he was himself of this opinion. He says:—

"The very question is impossible. You have no right to this question. Why? What is perfection? That which is beyond time, space and causation. That is perfect. Then you ask how the perfect became imperfect. In logical language the question may be put in this form. How that which is beyond causation became caused? You contradict yourself. You first admit that it is beyond causation and then ask what caused it. It will be nonsense to ask it, because the question is illogical."

No doubt Svāmi Vivekananda was a great Sannyasin, and I may say, a great scholar too. So I may say of Sri Sankarāchārya also, whom I may even call a much greater man than Svāmi Vivekananda. But truth is truth and facts are stubborn, and, I should not feel nervous to speak out what I think to be the truth.

This line of argument followed by the Māyāvādins in support of their illusion-theory is more or less on the same line with the Christian sophistry that we should not question the action of God, which they generally come out with, when confronted with some sound arguments which they cannot possibly meet. It is true that we are conditioned in our present state, and we do not go beyond this conditioned sphere of ours when we put the question, nor do we attempt

at having any survey of the Beyond. No, not at all. We confine ourselves to our own sphere, and say boldly that conditioned as it is, this illusion cannot be ascribed to the non-conditioned and infinite God. It is inconsistent to call this conditioned illusion to be the effect of the non-conditioned God. That is our argument, and our argument cannot be rebutted by the empty rebuke, "You dare not ask that question." We say that if this illusion is attributed to God, He cannot be called infinite; but the Māyāvādins say that because He is infinite, we cannot ask that question. This is begging the question. If objections are to be shelved into the convenient corner of the limited nature of our knowledge, surely there can be no means of finding out the truth.

There is still another point which I think will go a long way to convince you of the futility of the Māyāvāda theory. If there is no other object but God, how could we maintain that God is good, that God is love, and that He is beneficient? Whom does He do good? Whom does He love? Whom does His goodness benefit? Can we say that His goodness benefits the illusory forms for which He is Himself responsible? A benefit to illusory forms is no benefit at all, and even if it be a benefit, it cannot be said to His credit that they were all produced by His own action. God can only be supposed to do good, if His goodness will benefit beings for whose existence He is not responsible. So you will see that God cannot be called good or beneficient under the circumstances; but on the contrary He will have to be considered the source of evil, if the Māyāvāda theory is to be maintained. For, all the miseries of this wretched world owe their origin to His reflection on Māyā as this reflection produces an illusion under wich innumerable souls are produced and made to suffer for an indefinite period. And if such a thing is to continue eternally,—so long as God and Māyā exist—the malignity of the evil can be better imagined than described.

(To be continued)

S. S.

THE ŚAIVA SIDDHĀNTA MAHĀ SAMĀJAM.

Summary of the proceedings of a meeting held at Uttaramerur by Mr. K. U. Ponnusvāmi Mudaliyār, one of the Directors of the Śaiva Siddhānta-Mahā-Samāja, on 8th March:—(1) Lecture on "Temple worship" (2) Passing a resolution to the effect that the members of the Devāra-bakhtajana Sabha of the place should recite Tirumurai hyms in the various temples in the town and in the neighbourhood and that they should do the services known as Tiruttoṇḍu (திருத்தொண்டு) in the temples.

On 23rd March, Mr. K. U. Ponnusvami Mudaliyār, delivered a lecture on "Siddhāntam" at Tiruttani.

THE "ĀGAMIC BUREAU" NOTES.

Extract from the "Madras Mail" Dated the 6th March, 1912:—Studies in Śaiva Siddhānta—Mr. J. M. Nallasawmi Pillai has made Śaiva Siddhānta Philosophy his special field of research for over two decades, with the result that he is now looked upon as one of the acknowledged authorities on all questions relating to the subject. He has written and spoken a great deal regarding the doctrines of the school, and his studies in Śaiva Siddhānta now issued in a collected form (the Meykaṇḍān Press, Madras) will be welcomed as an authoritative exposition based on the author's critical researches and deep learning. The essays embodied in the work have all appeared at one time or another in the *Siddhānta Dīpika*, the *Madras Review*, the *New Reformer* and the pages of other periodicals, and have been widely read and appreciated by students in this country and in the West. The headings of the chapters, "The Tattvas and Beyond", "The Nature of Divine Personality", "God and World",

"Some Aspects of Godhead", "True Knowledge of Good and Evil," etc., give a good idea of the scope of the work. Mr. Nallasawmi Pillai's treatment of these is lucid and scholarly and ought to suggest lines of research-work to others interested in the subject.

***

Cosmogony has been dealt with by Manu. He says, "(originally) was this universe enveloped in darkness, invisible to sight, without any sign to indicate its existence." There was the only real Brahma "self-origined." Everything was hushed as if in profound sleep. The darkness enveloping the universe was the gloom of Prakṛiti, the primal nature from which He caused Mahat, the principle of apprehension to be evolved. From Mahat came forth the principle of Egoism, "the real incentive to all works." From the principle of Egoism were produced the five Tanmatras—the subtle sensibles. From them was generated, "the deathless Mind which is the procreating cause of all creations together with its subtle functions of inclination, antipathy etc.," and which in turn gave birth to the senses. Lastly, from the five Tanmatras were the elements evolved. "From the Subtle particles these seven Purusha-like principles of irrepressible energy, viz., the principles of Mahat, Egoism and the five Tanmatras has originated the universe. From the real has proceeded the phenomenal."

***

Yajñavalkya was one of the celebrated law-givers of Ancient India. There are now extant twenty Smṛitis or Dharma Sāstras one of which has been ascribed to him. The age in which he lived has been placed by Professor Wilson and others as far back as the second century after Christ. He is said to have lived in ancient Mithila—a tract of country in Behar—and delivered his precepts to an assembly of Philosophers there. His institutes the Hindus regard as next in importance to those of Manu. They are explained in one thousand and twenty-three couplets. They contain three parts of which

one is devoted to the exposition of religious ceremonies and general duties, one contains regulations to guide civil life and the last prescribes rules for the atonement of several sins. Throughout the work, here and there are interspersed passages which throw considerable light on the position which the Sudra occupied during those times in the general polity. It will be interesting and certainly instructive to make a study of this important subject especially at a time when eminent Indians are endeavouring to elevate the lower classes.

***

The question of animal food, as distinguished from vegetable food, has engaged the attention of ancient sages as well as of modern thinkers. The consideration is, what is the kind of food that is necessary for the harmonious growth of both the body and the mind? Unwholesome food ought to be avoided by all means possible. Some contend that a mixed diet is good. A few of those who are now vegetarians pure and simple wish to resort, to some extent, to animal food. But the progression seems to be towards vegetarianism. In the ages when religious sacrifices had been common in ancient India, there are strong reasons to believe that animal food must have been freely resorted to by all castes of people and to such an extent as had provoked the legislators of those days to frame regulations restricting the use to a few kinds. Manu laid down that God has created things in this world to be used as food by living beings that the animate eat the inanimate and that man eats both the animal and the vegetable. For he says: "whatever exists in the world, all that Prajāpati has ordained to be the food of living beings, all both mobile and immobile is the food of creatures. The immobile are the food of mobile ; the toothless ones are the food of the toothed creatures ; the handless are that of the hand-possessed ones ; and the timid are that of the brave " and recommends that 'flesh may be taken at the request of Brahmanas, and in diseases or under circumstances which imperil life'. But this general rule should not mislead us. He laid

several and strict prohibitions on the choice of man as to the kind of animal food that he should take for his health and progress. And the ideal he aimed at is: "He who does not wish to inflict on any animal the pain of death or captivity is said to be the well-wisher of all. Such a man obtains perfect felicity. Whatever he contemplates whatever he strives for, whatever he puts his heart upon, he gets that without effort if he does not kill any animal life."

***

"All the mobile and immobile things" are created, "each in the womb, best suited to it in consideration of the mission of its life." In these words Manu stated the truth that perpetuation of created beings takes place by reproduction. So far as modern researches go, reproduction of organic beings—the term including both the animals and plants—is of two kinds—non-sexual and sexual. By the former the individual throws out a portion of its body which develops itself into the form of the parent. Here there is no sex. But sexual reproduction is quite a distinct phenomenon. There are two germs—male and female. The sexual character is clearly marked out. There are two different individuals coming into contact. The result is impregnation. Each by itself is unable to reproduce, their combination is indispensable. Huxley, contrasting the two principles says: "But it is most assuredly the fact and it is presumable that however long the process of non-sexual multiplication could be continued—I say there is good reason to believe that it would come to an end if a new commencement were not obtained by a conjunction of the two sexual elements." Thus one of the very first laws of the universe has been set forth by both—the greatest law-giver of ancient India and the first Scientist of his day.